DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 833 UD 014 071

TITLE	An Evaluation of a Program of Reading Acceleration, Remediation and Enrichment for Secondary School Students in Poverty Areas. New York State Urban Education Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	58p.; Function Number 17-05461
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Resources; Individualized Reading; Inner City; Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Diagnosis; Reading Materials; *Remedial Reading Programs; Resource Allocations; *Secondary School Students; Small Group Instruction; Student Attitudes; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

The program of reading acceleration, remediation, and enrichment for secondary school students in poverty areas of the city was designed for eleventh and twelfth grade students reading between a 4.0 and 7.0 grade equivalency range. During the fall semester 56, and during the spring semester 62, low-income population academic and vocational high schools, including 4,500 students, participated in the program. The program involved the following services: (1) one additional full-time teaching position per school to be responsible for five classes of no more than 12 students; (2) individualized diagnosis and remediation of student reading problems; (3) an extensive teacher training program, including two full-day workshops and in-service consultation by three program teacher-trainers; and, (4) specific allocation of funds for books and materials. The overall objective of the program was to improve reading and comprehension ability as well as attitudes of participating students and to raise their level of reading proficiency to the 8.0 criterion necessary for diploma qualification in New York City. It was found that 63.3 percent of the full-year students improved at least one year or more in grade equivalent reading score; 57.5 percent of the students who attended the fall semester only achieved this criterion; and 50.4 percent of the spring term only students met this behavioral objective. Pupils' attitudes towards "reading" were significantly less positive at the end of the program. (Author/JM)

ED 087833

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF

A PROGRAM OF READING ACCELERATION, REMEDIATION AND ENRICHMENT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN POVERTY AREAS

FINAL REPORT

NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the New York State Urban Education Program enacted at the 1970 Legislative Session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty." (Education Law 3602, subdivision 11 as amended), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-1972 school year.

Evaluation Director
Harold A. Vine, Jr.

Assistant Director
Eric Brown

Center for Educational Research and Field Services
School of Education
New York University

August, 1972

UD 014 071

New York University

School of Education
Center for Educational Research and Field Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 Press Building
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
Telephone: (212) 598-2898, 3425

September 30, 1972

Dr. David Abramson
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Abramson:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated June 14, 1972 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Educational Research and Field Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final report, An Evaluation of a Program of Reading Acceleration, Remediation, and Enrichment for Secondary School Students in Poverty Areas.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under State Urban Education, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:jh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVALUATION STAFF vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii
LIST OF TABLES ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 3
EVALUATION PROCEDURE 5
Sampling 5
Instrumentation 6
Training of Evaluators 6
Schedule of Visits 7
FINDINGS 8
The Reading Test Scores 8
THE PUPILS 13
Structured Responses 13
The Instruction 21
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 27
APPENDIX A List of High Schools Visited 31
APPENDIX B Insturments 33
APPENDIX C Tables 47

EVALUATION STAFF

Director

Harold A. Vine, Jr., Assistant Professor of English Education, School of Education, New York University

Assistant Director

Eric Brown, Assistant Professor of Psycholinguistics, School of Education, New York University

Coordinator

Sherry Rubinstein, School of Education, New York University

Research Associate

Herbert Tannenbaum, School of Education, New York University

Research Assistants

Dan Hill, School of Education, New York University
Linda Sklar, School of Education, New York University
Joy Zigo, School of Education, New York University

Computer Consultant

Bert Holland, School of Education, New York University

Computer Assistants

Roxanna Blenman, School of Education, New York University
Phyllis B. Cohen, School of Education, New York University
Henia Drucker, School of Education, New York University
Jon Gray, School of Education, New York University
Rebecca Spicer, School of Education, New York University

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Sherry Rubinstein, for her always optimistic, cooperative, and efficient handling of the hundreds of details involved in organizing and administering the project;

To Herb Tannenbaum, for his always thoughtful, intelligent, and insightful assistance in evaluating the project;

To Dan Hill, Linda Sklar, and Joy Zigo, for their determined collection of the pupil data;

To Bert Holland and the computer assistants, for their prompt and accurate processing of the data; and

To Helen Kelly for her always helpful and considerate assistance and understanding

Thank you

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Mean Grade Equivalent Scores of All Pupils on Metropolitan Achievement Test	8
2.	Mean Grade Equivalent Growth Scores of All Pupils on Metropolitan Achievement Test	9
3.	Percentage of Pupils Scoring One, Two, Three, and Four or More Years below 8.0 Grade Level on the Metropolitan Achievement Test	9
4.	Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Growth Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test	10
5.	Means and Standard Deviations of Rate of Attendance for All Pupils	11
6.	Pupils Whose Scores Increased One Year or More on the Metropolitan Achievement Test	11
7.	Pupils Achieving 8.0 Criterion on Metropolitan Achievement Test	11
8.	Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on Metropolitan Achievement Test of Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above	12
9.	Mean Grade Equivalent Growth Scores on Metropolitan Achievement Test of Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above	12
10.	Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above Achieving 8.0 Criterion on the Metropolitan Achievement Test	12
11.	Languages Spoken in Homes of Pupils	13
12.	Means and Standard Deviations for Composite Scores on the Semantic Differential, Measuring Pupils' Attitudes Toward Three Concepts	14
13.	Number of Books Written in English (Not Counting Textbooks) Read During Past Month as Reported by Pupils	15
14.	Frequency of Reading as Reported by Pupils	15
15.	Comparison of Reading Class with Other Classes as Reported by Pupils	16
16.	Effect of Reading Class on Feelings about School as Reported by Pupils	16
17.	Feelings About Improvement in Reading as Reported by Pupils	17
18.	Change in Reading and Library Use Since Start of Reading Class as Reported by Pupils	17
19.	Extra-Curricular Effect of Reading Class as Reported by Pupils	18
20.	Characteristics of Reading Acceleration Staff	22
21.	Instructional Approaches Employed	23
22.	Instructional Materials that Teachers Found Most Effective in the Program	24
23.	Experts' Ratings of Classroom Presentation on a Five-Point Scale	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The program of reading acceleration, remediation, and enrichment for secondary school students in poverty areas of the city was designed for 11th and 12th grade students reading between a 4.0 and 7.0 grade equivalency range. During the fall semester 56, and during the spring semester 62, low-income population academic and vocational high schools, including 4,500 students, participated in the program.

The program involved the following services: (1) one additional full-time teaching position per school to be responsible for five classes of no more than twelve students; (2) individualized diagnosis and remediation of student reading problems; (3) an extensive teacher training program, including two full-day workshops and in-service consultation by three program teacher-trainers; and (4) specific allocation of funds for books and materials.

The overall objective of the program was to improve reading and comprehension ability as well as attitudes of participating students and to raise their level of reading proficiency to the 8.0 criterion necessary for diploma qualification in New York City.

The objectives of the evaluation were (1) to measure the extent of increase in reading ability of program students, (2) measure the extent to which students attain the 8.0 reading grade criterion, (3) evaluate the extent to which the program affects an increase in student positive attitude toward and interest in reading (originally numbered objectives 3 and 4), and (4) assess the degree to which the program increases the ability of teachers to use methods and materials for the diagnosis and remediation of reading disabilities (originally numbered objective 5).

To summarize the evaluation results and provide an overview for those findings, the attainment of specific behavioral objectives is delineated here:

1. To increase reading ability of all program students.
   Behavioral Criterion: At least 30 percent of the students will improve a minimum of one grade.

This criterion of success was fully exceeded, with 63.3 percent of the full-year students improving at least one year or more in grade equivalent reading score (see Table 6). What is perhaps even more significant is that 57.5 percent of the students who attended the fall semester only achieved this criterion, and that 50.4 percent of the spring term only students met this behavioral objective.

2. To enable students who read above 7.0 to attain the 8.0 reading grade.
   Behavioral Criterion: At least 30 percent of those whose initial reading grade is 7.1 or greater will attain this achievement score.

By final tabulation, of all the students who entered the program with a reading grade of 7.1 or greater, fully 75.6 percent achieved the 8.0 criterion (see Table 10). This figure includes those students who graduated from the program in January because they had already exceeded this figure.

3. To enable students to demonstrate an increased positive attitude toward and interest in reading.
   Behavioral Criterion: At least 50 percent of the student population will show a positive significant difference in attitude toward reading as measured on pre-post attitude scales. Reports will show that 40 percent of the students have read at least one book within a five-month period.

Only the latter objective was achieved. Pupils' attitudes at the end of the program were significantly less positive towards "reading" and "this class" than they had been at the beginning of the program. Pupils' interests had improved, however: teachers reported that 73 percent of the pupils had read one or more books and pupils, themselves, reported that 62 percent had read three or more books in the course of a semester (see Table 13).

4. To develop and increase the ability of program teachers to use materials and methods for the diagnosis and remediation of reading disabilities.
   Behavioral Criterion: In the rating of teacher performance, 50 percent of the teachers will score at the mid-point or above on a scale of utilization of skill.

This objective was achieved. Exactly 81.6 percent of the teachers observed scored at 3.0 or better on a 5-point scale involving utilization of skill (see Table 23).

In sum, we may note that all of the major behavioral objectives were achieved and surpased.

The following recommendations were made for the purpose of suggesting specific ways in which a sound program may be further improved:

1. The program should be refunded for another year and, if possible, started in the freshman and sophomore years if there are to be more important academic and vocational gains.
2. The criteria for evaluating the success of the program should be made more stringent.
3. A larger percentage of the teachers chosen for the program should be qualified to teach reading, and the inservice training of teachers should be expanded to insure more effective instruction in the knowledge and techniques of diagnosing and remediating reading instruction.
4. The procurement and allocation of materials should be greatly revised in order to meet more effectively the reading needs and interests of individual program teachers and pupils.
5. The students' activities in the program and their activities throughout the rest of the school day should be related.
6. The program should provide more adequate instruction for pupils whose major problem is English as a second language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the auspices of the New York State Urban Education Program and the New York City Board of Education, a reading acceleration, remediation, and enrichment program was established – for the fourth year in a row – for secondary school students in selected low socio-economic areas of the city. The program was designed to improve the reading ability and comprehension of high school students who were currently reading below an eighth grade criterion level as measured on a standardized reading test. The principle target was the group of 11th and 12th grade students whose reading scores were in the range of 4.0 to 7.0. The overall objective was to improve the reading and comprehension ability of these students and to raise their reading scores to 8.0 or above, the present level of proficiency necessary for a high school diploma in New York City. There were 56 low income population academic and vocational high schools involved in the program[1] (six more schools were added at mid-year), and some 4,500 pupils took part.

In each of the 56 high schools one additional full-time position in reading was established under special conditions. The teacher was to be responsible for no more than 12 students in each of five classes each day, for a total of 25 periods a week. The emphasis was to be on individualized instruction following diagnosis and analysis of each student's particular reading problems. It was hoped that the program would foster an increased interest in reading for these students by encouraging more extensive individual reading. The program provided that first priority would be given to students in the 11th and 12th grades who were below the 8.0 reading level. Second priority would be given to students in the 9th and 10th grade. Each student selected for the program was to meet the class once a day, in addition to his regular English class, until the 8.0 criterion was met, at which point he was to be graduated from the program.

An important component of the program was teacher training in the techniques of diagnosis and remediation of reading disabilities. To this end a reading consultant staff composed of the coordinator and two teacher-trainers visited and worked with the program teachers at their schools. The role of the reading consultant staff was to assist teachers in implementing the program guidelines and help in securing tests and materials where needed. In addition, two all-day institutes for teacher training were held, for which substitute teachers were hired so that schools could release their personnel for the day. The program also had a budget for providing books and materials for the various program classes.

The objectives of the program were:

1. To increase the reading ability of all program participants, with at least 30 percent of the students improving by a minimum of one grade, as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test, during the school year.

[1] See Appendix A for list of schools visited.

2. To enable program participants to attain the 8.0 reading grade required for a high school diploma, with at least 30 percent of those whose initial reading grade was 7.1 and greater attaining this goal during the course of the school year.
3. To enable students to demonstrate an increased positive attitude toward and interest in reading. At least 50 percent of the student population will show a positive significant difference in attitude toward reading as measured on pre-post attitude scales; and reports will indicate that 40 percent of the students in the program had read at least one book within a five-month period as an index of increased independent reading.
4. To develop and increase the ability of program teachers to use methods, materials and programs for diagnosis and remediation of reading disabilities (originally numbered objective 5). Fifty percent of the program teachers will achieve a score at the mid-point or above on a scale of utilization[1] of skill as well as a substantial degree of self-confidence and interest as reflected in questionnaires and interviews.

[1] Although the original criterion was stated to be "at least 3.5 on a 7-point scale," it was changed to be "3.0 on a 5-point scale" – a slightly more rigerous criterion.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The general purpose of the evaluation was to investigate the implementation and effectiveness of the program as described. In general, hard data on pupil achievement was collected through standardized tests, while attitude and motivation changes were measured by the evaluation staff using questionnaires, rating scales, observation, and on-site structured interview techniques.

Sampling

Evaluation Objective 1: To measure the extent of increase in reading ability of program students.

One hundred percent of the project students were given a standardized reading test in the Metropolitan Achievement Series in September, February, and June. An increase of at least one reading grade during the school year for 30 percent of the project students was the standard for achievement. Data collected included subtest score, average score, time of participation, and number of absences. The scores were tallied and analyzed for gain scores. Correlations, frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations were computed.

Evaluation Objective 2: To measure the extent to which pupils attain the 8.0 reading grade.

Data on achievement scores of 100 percent of the participating students were analyzed to measure the extent of achievement of this objective. The standard for achievement was the attainment of the required 8.0 reading grade by at least 30 percent of those students who entered the program with initial reading grade level equivalents of 7.1 or greater. Data was collected from the testing as described in Objective 1 and was analyzed to furnish frequency and percentage distributions of the pupils who achieved this objective and those who did not. Achievement scores of students were examined for applicable factors.

Evaluation Objective 3: To evaluate the extent to which the program affects an increase in student positive attitude toward and interest in reading.

During the fall semester and again during the spring semester, a random sample of two thirds of the program students were administered attitude inventories and questionnaires by the evaluation team. Attitudes toward reading would be indicated by a positive significant difference in pre-post scores on attitude scales for at least 50 percent of the pupil population. Interest in reading would be reflected by a report of 40 percent of the students having read at least one book during a five-month period. The data on pupils' changes of interest in reading and assessment of the program's effectiveness were analyzed by frequency distributions, gain scores, and percentages.

Evaluation Objective 4: To assess the degree to which the program increases the ability of teachers to diagnose and remediate reading disabilities.

One hundred percent sample of remedial reading teachers was used to furnish data on teacher effectiveness. The evaluation staff collected information by using questionnaires, rating scales, and observational techniques. Evaluations of reading instruction were made through on-site classroom observation. It was expected that at least 50 percent of the program teachers would achieve a score at mid-point or above on a scale of utilization of skill, showing substantial ability in using appropriate methods of diagnosis and remediation. It was also expected that there would be a significant display of self-confidence and interest as reflected in the interviews. All data was collected during on-site visits throughout the first and second semester. The above data was analyzed in terms of measures of central tendency and distributions relating to effective training.

Instrumentation

The principal evaluation measure was the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970) Advanced Version for the assessment of reading achievement. This is a widely used test instrument in the New York City School System and its use was mandated in the program guidelines. Consequently, the merits and associated statistics of this instrument will not be discussed here. Three forms of the advanced test were administered to the entire subject population in September, February, and June.

In addition, a semantic differential scale[1] was devised to measure pupils' attitudes toward three concepts: "School," "This Class," and "Reading"; and a student questionnaire was created to assess the extent of students' outside reading; their attitudes towards reading, the reading class, and school; and their general plans and comments. Also a questionnaire and rating form were devised for interviewing the teacher and observing the reading instruction (see Appendix B for copies of all instruments).

Training of Evaluators

The research project directors and the research associate were the only staff members who made direct observational judgments of classroom conditions and teacher performance. Techniques were worked out conjointly over a number of training sessions, and inter-judge reliability among the three raters was good. Three research assistants helped in the development of the student questionnaires and self-rating instruments, and a well-practiced routine was created for the administration of these tests in a classroom setting. All members of the staff were familiar with the overall goals of the program and contributed anecdotal observations as the occasion arose.

[1] See Osgood, C., Suici, G., and Tannenbaum, P., *The Measurement of Meaning*, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Schedule of Visits

Each teacher in the program was observed over a half day period of time by either one of the evaluation directors or the research associate. In addition to classroom observation, the evaluators were also able to interview teachers and discuss the success of the program with either the English Chairman or Reading Coordinator in the school involved.

Two full-day visits to two-thirds of the schools each semester were conducted by one of the three research assistants for the purpose of administering the student questionnaires and semantic differential rating forms. The administration of both of these instruments usually took the entire class period in each of the classes with the teacher in most instances absent.

FINDINGS

The Reading Test Scores

As was noted earlier, the Advanced Metropolitan Achievement Test was given to all the pupils in the program in September, February, and June. Old forms Am, Bm, Cm, and new forms F, G, and H of the test were used. For statistical purposes, those pupils kept in the program after achieving the 8.0 criterion were considered as being dropped at the time of achievement. Subjects whose scores were reported at 8.0 at the beginning of either the fall or spring semester also were disregarded, whether the teacher kept them in the class or not. Because a chance score on the MAT Advanced gives a minimum reading grade equivalent of 3.0, subjects scoring below 3.1 were also not counted in the statistical analysis. Finally, subjects for whom there was missing test score data were also removed from the analysis.

In addition, there were three distinct groups of students: those who participated in the program for the entire academic year (N = 1225), those who participated in the fall semester only (N = 1569), and those who participated in the spring semester only (N = 1753). The spring semester pupils were replacements for students who were dropped at mid-year and included the additional pupils from the six new schools that were added in February. The numbers in each group show that the program's turnover rate was significant.

Inspection of Tables 1 and 2 reveals that significant reading growth occurred for not only the full year group, but also for those participating for one semester only. It will be noted that all three groups started at approximately a sixth grade reading level and that the total growth for all three groups was almost identical. It is interesting to note, also, that the single semester groups grew almost as much in that one semester as did the full year group throughout the course of two semesters.

TABLE 1

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores of All Pupils on Metropolitan Achievement Test

		September 1971		February 1972		June 1972	
Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Full Year	1225	5.72	1.06	6.19	1.04	7.11	1.37
Fall Only	1569	6.16	1.12	7.46	1.62		
Spring Only	1753			6.04	1.14	7.08	1.53

TABLE 2

Mean Grade Equivalent Growth Scores of All Pupils of Metropolitan Achievement Test*

Group	N	Fall Growth Mean	Fall Growth S.D.	Spring Growth Mean	Spring Growth S.D.	Full Growth Mean	Full Growth S.D.
Full Year	1225	0.47	0.87	0.92	1.10	1.39	1.23
Fall Only	1569	1.30	1.22				
Spring Only	1753			1.04	1.11		

*Because of the large N, all of these growth scores are significant at the .01 level.

Table 3 shows the percentage of pupils scoring one, two, three, and four or more years below 8.0 grade level. These figures indicate that whereas approximately 50 percent of the pupils were scoring two or more years below and 75 percent were scoring one or more years below the 8.0 level at the beginning of the program, only 25 percent were scoring two or more years below and less than 50 percent were scoring one or more years below the 8.0 level at the end of the program. Table 4 gives the proportionate breakdowns on the extent of total reading growth. Again, it is to be observed that on the average, students experienced well over a full year's reading gain during the course of the program.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Pupils Scoring One, Two, Three, and Four or More Years below 8.0 Grade Level on the Metropolitan Achievement Test

Number of Years below 8.0 Grade Level	Full Year Group (N = 1225) Sept.	Full Year Group (N = 1225) June	Fall Only Group (N = 1570) Sept.	Fall Only Group (N = 1570) Feb.	Spring Only Group (N = 1753) Feb.	Spring Only Group (N = 1753) June
0.1 or more	100.0	65.1	100.0	53.1	100.0	66.5
1 or more	88.3	47.1	72.6	38.5	76.3	49.7
2 or more	61.4	23.5	43.0	20.6	47.4	27.4
3 or more	27.0	7.4	18.9	9.1	21.7	9.8
4 or more	6.3	1.0	4.4	1.8	5.3	1.4

Table 5 shows the rate of attendance for the three groups. Rate of attendance was used in order to equate the full year and semester only populations. Total number of school days a student could have attended was divided into number of actual days a particular student did attend. Students attended an average of 90 percent of all possible classes. This high

rate of attendance is quite good considering the fact that in most of the high schools surveyed overall school attendance was at a much lower figure (about 75 percent). This confirms an observation by many teachers and school officials that attendance in these special reading classes was much better than for other academic and vocational classes within the school. An additional column in this table displays the correlation of the rate of attendance with reading growth scores. These are disappointingly low, even though the rate of attendance is limited. This would indicate that a student's attendance, or lack of it, is not predictive of his success in the program.

TABLE 4

Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Growth Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test

Grade Equivalent Interval	Total Growth of Full Year Group (N = 1570)		Fall Growth of Fall Only Group (N = 1225)		Spring Growth of Spring Only Group (N = 1753)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
-3.0 – -2.1	2	0.2	6	0.4	7	0.4
-2.0 – -1.1	17	1.4	20	1.3	44	2.5
-1.0 – -0.1	112	9.1	137	8.8	184	10.5
0.0 – 0.9	319	26.0	503	32.0	634	36.2
1.0 – 1.9	413	33.7	478	30.4	556	31.7
2.0 – 2.9	236	19.3	293	18.7	230	13.1
3.0 – 3.9	95	7.7	97	6.2	83	4.8
4.0 – 4.9	21	1.7	23	1.4	13	0.7
5.0 – 5.9	6	0.5	9	0.5	2	0.1
6.0 – 6.9	3	0.3	3	0.2	0	0.0
7.0 – 7.9	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0

Table 6 states that for all the pupils in the program, over 50 percent made a year or more gain in reading growth. These findings act as a strong affirmation of the achievement of the first behavioral objective, requiring 30 percent to achieve this criterion performance. Given that these students were on the average reading below the sixth grade level, and that they consequently must have experienced repeated academic failure and frustration throughout their secondary education, makes these findings all the more remarkable. Here, too, we also see that over half of the students who participated for only a semester also achieved a year or more growth.

TABLE 5

Means and Standard Deviations
of Rate of Attendance for All Pupils

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	(Attendance with MAT Growth Scores)	P
Full Year	1225	.91	.08	.14	.01
Fall Only	1569	.90	.10	.16	.01
Spring Only	1753	.90	.09	.08	.01

TABLE 6

Pupils Whose Scores Increased One Year or More
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test

Group	Total N	N Having Increased Score of One Year or More	Percent
Full Year	1225	775	63.3
Fall Only	1570	904	57.5
Spring Only	1753	884	50.4
All Groups*	4548	2563	56.4

*For 1970-71 program, scores were: 2708, 1569, 57.9

Although the behavioral guidelines only discussed the 8.0 grade equivalent reading score in terms of those who entered the program at 7.1 or greater, it is perhaps significant that approximately 40 percent of *all* program participants achieved this criterion of success (see Table 7).

TABLE 7

Pupils Achieving 8.0 Criterion on
Metropolitan Achievement Test

Group	Total N	N Achieving 8.0	Percent
Full Year	1225	420	34.3
Fall Only	1570	736	46.9
Spring Only	1753	588	33.5
All Groups*	4548	1744	38.3

*For 1970-71 program, scores were: 2708, 1144, 42.2

The 7.1 and greater data as outlined in the second behavioral objective are found in Tables 8 and 9. The grade scores indicate that for all three of these groups the average entrance score was practically identical (7.4). Although there is a decline for the full year group on the February testing, this is an artifact caused by the fact that first semester students who were dropped from the program at mid-year because they had already achieved 8.0 are not in this average. It is interesting to note that the fall only group made the largest gains (almost twice those of the full year group), followed by the spring only group.

TABLE 8

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores on Metropolitan Achievement Test
on Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above

		September 1971		February 1972		June 1972	
Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Full Year	144	7.40	0.24	7.11	0.74	8.04	1.08
Fall Only	429	7.44	0.25	8.62	0.98		
Spring Only	415			7.43	0.32	8.39	1.17

TABLE 9

Mean Grade Equivalent Growth Scores on Metropolitan Achievement Test
of Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above

		Fall Growth		Spring Growth		Full Growth	
Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Full Year	144	-0.29	0.79	0.93	1.06	0.64	1.10
Fall Only	429	1.18	0.97				
Spring Only	415			0.96	1.15		

Table 10 shows that of all the pupils who entered the program with a reading grade of 7.1 or greater, over 75 percent achieved the 8.0 criterion. Thus behavioral objective two was more than adequately attained.

TABLE 10

Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above
Pupils Beginning at 7.1 and Above Achieving 8.0 Criterion on the

Group	Total N	N Achieving 8.0	Percent
Full Year	144	95	65.9
Fall Only	429	347	80.8
Spring Only	415	305	73.5
All Groups*	988	747	75.6

*For 1970-71 program, scores were: 577, 447, 77.5

THE PUPILS

Structured Responses

Table 11 indicates the language background of a random sample of approximately half of the program pupils. What is significantly portrayed here is that only half of the program pupils come from homes where English is the primary language spoken. In fact, approximately 25 percent come from homes where English is seldom spoken. The ramifications of these findings are significant and will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

To ascertain whether program pupils' attitudes toward "school," "this class" and "reading" changed during the course of the year, a random sample of 339 students were asked to rate these three items on seven-point, bipolar semantic differential scales in the fall semester and again during the spring semester. (Procedures and test instruments will be found in Appendix B.) An additional proportion of fall only and spring only pupils were asked to evaluate the same three concepts. The results in Table 12 indicate that pupils' attitudes toward all three concepts were lower during the spring than during the fall semester. This data quite clearly indicates that the program did not significantly improve pupils' attitudes towards these concepts, at least as measured by the semantic differential instrument. The decline in positive attitude might be attributed to what might be called the "spring fever phenomenon": for many youths school is more appealing during the rather inclement weather of the fall and winter than during the sunshine of the spring. In spite of this, the data shows that pupils' attitudes toward "this class" and "reading" are significantly higher than their attitudes toward "school," indicating rather dramatically their positive attitude toward the Reading Acceleration Program.[1]

TABLE 11

Languages Spoken in Homes of Pupils

	Fall Semester Group (N = 1555)		Spring Semester Group (N = 1091)	
Languages	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mostly English	827	53.5	536	49.1
Mostly Spanish	293	18.9	240	22.0
Mostly Chinese	39	2.5	19	1.7
Mostly French	28	1.8	26	2.4
English & Spanish equally	267	17.3	200	18.4
English & Chinese equally	9	0.6	8	0.7
English & French equally	13	0.8	14	1.3
Other	71	4.6	48	4.4

[1] Of course, since pupils' measured attitudes toward reading were 5.70 or better for all three groups on a 7-point scale (see Table 12), it was impossible to use one of the criteria mentioned in the original evaluation proposal: "4 (b) . . . It is expected that 40% to 60% of the sample will increase at least two points on a seven-point interest scale.")

TABLE 12

Means and Standard Deviations for Composite Scores on the Semantic Differential, Measuring Pupils' Attitudes Toward Three Concepts

Total Year Group (N = 339)

Concepts	Fall Semester Mean	Fall Semester S.D.	Spring Semester Mean	Spring Semester S.D.	F	P
School	5.23	1.75	5.01	1.66	14.55	.001
This Class	6.00	1.46	5.84	1.48	9.46	.003
Reading	5.96	1.48	5.79	1.45	9.20	.003

Fall Semester Only Group (N = 1215)

	Fall Semester Mean	Fall Semester S.D.
School	5.18	1.68
This Class	5.98	1.42
Reading	5.91	1.45

Spring Semester Only Group (N = 792)

	Spring Semester Mean	Spring Semester S.D.
School	4.92	1.70
This Class	5.72	1.55
Reading	5.70	1.52

The results of the student questionnaire items devoted to measuring pupils' reading habits and the effects of reading on their lives are reported in Tables 13-19. Table 13 shows that over 60 percent of the program students read three or more books a semester. Since last year's evaluation found that the students' report of their own reading was more conservative than the teachers' report of student reading (perhaps because pupils had less reason to try to impress the evaluators with their success), the figures in Table 13 are used to show that behavioral objective three (40 percent of the students will read at least one book) was amply attained.[1]

[1] The teachers' reports indicated that 73 percent of the pupils had read one or more books.

TABLE 13

Number of Books Written in English (Not Counting Textbooks) Read During Past Month as Reported by Pupils

Number of Books	Fall Semester Group (N = 1548) Frequency	Percent	Spring Semester Group (N = 1089) Frequency	Percent
0 – 2	605	39.1	413	37.9
3 – 4	592	38.2	419	38.6
5 – 6	196	12.7	156	14.3
7 – 9	90	5.8	57	5.2
10 or more	65	4.2	44	4.0

Table 14 breaks down this figure by reporting frequencies for types of reading. It can be seen that newspapers, and then magazines, are more often read than books and comic books.

TABLE 14

Frequency of Reading as Reported by Pupils

Type and Amount of Reading	Fall Semester Group (N = 1550) Frequency	Percent	Spring Semester Group (N = 1100) Frequency	Percent
BOOKS:				
Never	22	1.4	23	2.1
Rarely	210	13.5	179	16.3
Sometimes	914	59.0	625	56.8
Often	404	26.1	273	24.8
MAGAZINES:				
Never	67	4.4	50	4.6
Rarely	292	18.9	187	17.0
Sometimes	672	43.3	504	45.8
Often	519	33.4	359	32.6
NEWSPAPERS:				
Never	57	3.8	36	3.3
Rarely	213	13.8	181	16.5
Sometimes	529	34.1	335	30.5
Often	751	48.3	548	49.7
COMIC BOOKS:				
Never	445	28.7	326	29.7
Rarely	434	28.0	310	28.2
Sometimes	406	26.2	289	26.2
Often	265	17.1	175	15.9

One question asked for students to compare the reading class with their other classes in school. As reported in Table 15, most thought this class was better than average. When asked if the reading class had changed their feelings about school, about 50 percent said that they felt the same; about 50 percent said they felt school was better (Table 16). In answer to a question about their feelings of progress or improvement in reading, over 80 percent felt they had improved (Table 17). Table 18 shows that about 80 percent thought they were reading more than they used to, and approximately 40 percent felt they were using the library more.

TABLE 15

Comparison of Reading Class with Other Classes as Reported by Pupils

	Fall Semester Group (N = 1544)		Spring Semester Group (N = 1094)	
This Class is	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Much Worse	32	2.1	39	3.6
A Little Worse	52	3.4	61	5.6
About the Same	345	22.2	271	24.8
A Little Better	481	31.2	304	27.8
Much Better	634	41.1	419	38.2

On the larger questions associated with the success of the reading program – those problems related to general academic and vocational attainment – approximately 80 percent of the students suggested that they were learning things of help to them outside the school situation, and over 90 percent thought that the reading course had markedly improved their prospects of gaining a high school diploma (Table 19).[1]

TABLE 16

Effect of Reading Class on Feelings about School as Reported by Pupils

	Fall Semester Group (N = 1543)		Spring Semester Group (N = 1093)	
School is	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
A Lot Worse	30	1.9	30	2.7
A Little Worse	47	3.0	48	4.4
About the Same	691	44.9	535	48.9
A Little Better	491	31.8	320	29.4
A Lot Better	284	18.4	160	14.6

[1] Teachers' ratings of the pupils confirmed those of the pupils, themselves. On a scale of 1-5 (1 – poor; 5 – excellent), 60 of the teachers rated the program pupils' *attitude* as 4.60, *attention* as 3.60, *behavior* as 4.20, and *interest in reading* as 4.0.

TABLE 17

Feelings About Improvement in Reading As Reported by Pupils

My Reading This Year	Fall Semester Group (N = 1542) Frequency	Percent	Spring Semester Group (N = 1092) Frequency	Percent
Is a Lot Worse	13	0.8	13	1.2
Is a Little Worse	32	2.1	31	2.8
Is about the Same	189	12.3	145	13.3
Is a Little Better	791	51.3	529	48.4
Is a Lot Better	517	33.5	374	34.3

TABLE 18

Change in Reading and Library Use Since Start of Reading Class as Reported by Pupils[1]

Reading	Fall Semester Group (N = 1531) Frequency	Percent	Spring Semester Group (N = 1081) Frequency	Percent
Reading a Lot Less	59	4.0	46	4.5
Reading a Little Less	49	3.4	34	3.4
Reading the Same Amount	157	10.3	148	13.8
Reading a Little More	609	39.6	435	40.0
Reading a Lot More	657	42.7	418	38.3
Library Use				
Using the Library a Lot Less	201	13.1	180	16.7
Using the Library a Little Less	212	13.8	157	14.5
Using the Library as Often	449	29.3	316	29.2
Using the Library a Little More	469	30.7	320	29.6
Using the Library a Lot More	200	13.1	108	10.0

[1] As a result of the on-site visits it was discovered that many program classrooms had their own libraries for program students' use. Thus it was decided that any additional survey of the extent of increase of students' use of the *school* library facilities was inappropriate, for it would not be an accurate measure of the program's effectiveness.

TABLE 19

Extra-Curricular Effect of Reading Class as Reported by Pupils

Are you learning things in this reading class that help you outside of school?	Fall Semester Group (N = 1530) Frequency	Percent	Spring Semester Group (N = 1071) Frequency	Percent
NO	235	15.6	202	19.2
YES	1295	84.4	869	80.8
Do you think that this class is helping your chances of getting a high school diploma?				
NO	80	5.2	89	8.3
YES	1450	94.8	982	91.7

Open Responses

Although the structured responses on the questionnaire indicated the students' strong regard for the value of the program, the responses to the unstructured final question revealed more dramatically their views of both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Of over the 900 written responses that discussed the program (approximately one-tenth of the total number of responses made no mention of the program), 80 percent talked about it enthusiastically. Students who praised the program mentioned the relaxed atmosphere of their reading classes, the individual help received, the encouraging support of their teacher, and – most of all – the opportunity to graduate high school with a high school diploma. Typical of these responses[1] are the following from seven different schools:

> I think we need a lot more classes like this, for the students w[illegible] are reading below grade level.

> I think that is Reading Class should be in all the High Schools, because it helps a person to read you learn how to pronunce the words. You are taught not to be scared of words you haven't seen before, and if you are going to graduate and your reading grade is not high this is the class to go to. The reading material that is given to you is so good that you will learn to read. And it helps to have an understanding teacher who will help you to enjoy the class. So I say it again if none of the other H.S. in N.Y. have this reading program I hope that they take my words when I say it is worth while.

> I didn't like to read any books before I entered this class. But now since my reading has gone up I read alot more than I did before. This class has helped me a lot. I like to read now more than before. It helps you to learn alot more and is not as awful as my other classes. [My teacher] has helped me alot. If it wasn't for him I wouldn't be interested in reading more.

[1] All responses are quoted exactly the way they were given.

The reading class should be continued today, tomorrow, and always to help us bring up our reading grade up and even higher.

I feel that all English classes should be like the reading program because you feel more free and it help you learn to speak out in public not being afraid. This class gives you the feeling of picking up a book once in a while and also discussing books you read with your friends. The teacher is really nice, he gives us this feeling that we can do it by having him at our side. That really makes the student happy. Some teachers in the English department well they got to go, their help isn't really anything. They expect you to do work right when you have no one there to understand you and also help you. Out of all my years in high school this is the only English class I can say I like & enjoy being in. "Keep the program its really nice"

I don't know who I am writing but I like to tell you that this reading class is one of the best programs they have in this school. It helped me alot for the simple fact I wanted to be helped.

You're not forced in any way. You get a lot of special attention. And you're on your own to help yourself. This class is more like a college course. do it if you like because no one forcing you and no one going to run after to ask why you cut or didn't come.

This class did me more than good and I'am glad to be in without this program I may as well say I'am lost or a failure.

Well I want to tell you that ever since I got into this class it have help me where I make my mistake. How I should improve it. The best thing I admire most is that the teacher help us with understanding. I like this reading class because for myself I have a low reading grade I would like to improve.

I hope that the Reading Program *stays* because there are more kids that would want to improve their reading, and I am one of them.

P.S. If the reading program is off alot of kids are going to suffer and it is not going to be their fault, because they will never find out where their mistake will be.

Almost as frequently mentioned were the students' wishes that they had entered the program earlier and that the program would begin in the freshmen or sophomore year:

I think this class is very good. But I think you should have more of this class. For example my sister she has a very low reading grade. She want this class. I was luck that they took me. And there are alot of girls that wants to get their diploma. I know that my reading grade will improve by the time I'll be a senior. And I'll get a high school diploma. With the help of God too.

I wish I had this class from the first year I came to this school, and I would take each term by knew I should have a double of the grade that I need. But knew it's too late. I'm graduate in two more weeks, but in this class I learned much more that I didn't knew.

Of the responses that criticized the program, one of the most frequently occurring spoke of the boring nature of the classes, of the lack of variety in activities and materials, of not being allowed to read what they wanted to read, and of the need for more interesting books to read and even take home.

> Sometimes this class is a bore. I know you have to increase your level. But lets do something different. Read pamphlets about drugs or different things. But I'm tired of doing the same S.R.A. cards. You get sick of doing it. Once a week, we should have a discussion.

Even those who liked the program mentioned the need for more and better paperbacks:

> I really like reading clinic and I also want the teacher to know that I'm really enjoying myself with her around. She's a very nice teacher. I like the way she is. I think that this class should have more books stories about teenagers, from other places what kind of feelings they have about school. How they like their teachers. I think that the teacher should know that we need more books to read at home or in school.

> In the reading class we have different methods that we use for reading. The one that interest me the most is the small library were we have books on different topics that we like. I think that we should have more books so that we can find more to read about. Like when you finish a book you just turn around and take a new one and start again.

One of the major problems for students in the program was the high levels of anxiety aroused by the test. Achieving 8.0 on the MAT was literally a life and death matter and many individuals contended that their true performance would be a good deal better if the test were untimed (a power test) and if they could be given more practice in test-taking:

> I think we should do more reading for pleasure. Instead of doing other things that I think they are not interesting.

> They should give more reading test so we could improve our reading.

Throughout the written responses, however, the major cry for help and the major paean of praise seemed to come from students whose real problem was English as a second language. These students had no reading problem per se, and once the language barrier was surmounted they often would make great gains. But too often in these reading classes the real nature of their problem was unrecognized and, therefore, uncorrected.

> I got english problem understanding and reading & writing

> I am student that my reading don't go up. I am very upset about this. Sometimes I think that I don't going to get my diploma Because I only has a few years here. I came from Puerto Rico. I read a lot of english but still I have a poor reading score. I try to help myself but sometimes I feel very upset.

> I should know the English language because I talk a little. I speak French very well. I need help for the English language. this is the reason I can't understand any class.

> I came from P.R. no longer ago. That is how I am in this Reading class. I feel that's not fear. If you have a language problem not getting your Diploma. I tried by best reading in my house and every place I go. But my reading is not in the 8 p. yet. Is more then 7 points

Many of these ESL students sensed the solutions to their problem better than did their teachers. What the pupils kept requesting was help with vocabulary and more help with learning to speak and listen to English before being asked to read it.

> I think this Reading Program is very helpful for student who are trying to improve their reading, want a diploma. But I would say that the majority of the student have two languages or maybe three. And many of them don't even speak English that well. The Reading Program have helped me raise my reading grade a couple of points. I will be getting my diploma when I graduate (72). But I think beside this program helping student raise and improve their reading skill it should help a student with the English language. I really don't know if their is any connection but this is now I feel. I would say up to now this Program has been helping student a lot but it could do more.

The Instruction

Table 20 describes salient characteristics of the Reading Acceleration staff. What is important to note is that over 90 percent were licensed to teach English; over 75 percent had master's degrees in English, reading, or English-related areas; 75 percent had taken one or more courses in reading – though 25 percent had had no formal training in reading; the majority of the staff had from three to ten years of teaching experience; and over 80 percent had previous experience teaching in the program. In sum, approximately 75 percent of the staff were qualified to teach in the program.

The California Reading Test was the most widely used instrument for diagnosing pupils' reading problems, followed by the Spache Test. Only a few teachers used an informal reading inventory.

Table 21 indicates the types of instructional approaches used in the program. In contrast to last year's finding that the "Hooked on Books" approach was the most frequently used, this year's observations revealed that most teachers were relying heavily on the various packaged kits (referred to in the table as "individual workbooks") to carry the program. Although many pupils liked the immediate feedback provided by the kits' readily available answer keys, the evaluators discovered that many of the students were unable to explain why a certain answer was correct or incorrect after the comprehension items had been scored. Furthermore, many of the pupils found four or five days of doing only workbook exercises too tiresome. What was encouraging about the teaching approaches observed this year, however, was their variety. Rather than forcing a unilateral application of one teaching model, this year's program seemed to be allowing teachers to capitalize on their own unique competencies. In fact, many teachers praised the program for allowing them the freedom and flexibility to employ those materials and techniques which they felt most comfortable using. The challenge for the program is to emphasize those teaching approaches comfortable to the teacher that also are valuable for the student.

TABLE 20

Characteristics of Reading Acceleration Staff

N = 60

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
TYPE OF TEACHING LICENSE:		
Regular English	53	88.33
Regular Other	1	1.67
Substitute English	2	3.33
Substitute Other	4	6.67
MA DEGREE:		
No MA Degree	8	13.33
MA Degree in		
English	33	55.00
Reading	8	13.33
English-Related	4	6.67
Other	7	11.67
NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN IN READING:		
None	15	25.00
1-2	29	48.33
3-4	9	15.00
over 4	7	11.67
YEARS TEACHING:		
1-2	6	10.00
3-5	19	31.67
6-10	19	31.67
11-15	7	11.67
16-20	7	11.67
over 20	2	3.32
YEARS EXPERIENCE IN READING ACCELERATION PROGRAM:		
1st year	11	18.33
2d year	30	50.00
3d year	13	21.67
4th year	6	10.00

TABLE 21

Instructional Approaches Employed

N = 60

Approaches Employed	Frequency	Percent
MAJOR EMPHASIS: READING FOR ENJOYMENT		
100% reading for enjoyment	1	1.67
80% reading for enjoyment; 20% other	2	3.33
MAJOR EMPHASIS: READING FOR READING		
100% individual workbook	20	33.33
80% individual workbook; 20% group	3	5.00
30% individual workbook; 20% reading for enjoyment	8	13.33
60% individual workbook; 40% group	6	10.00
60% individual workbook; 20% group; 20% reading for enjoyment	7	11.67
60% individual workbook; 20% reading for enjoyment; 20% wrap-up	2	3.33
60% group; 40% individual workbook	3	5.00
60% group; 20% individual workbook; 20% reading for enjoyment	1	1.67
40% individual workbook; 40% group; 20% reading for enjoyment	7	11.67

When asked what instructional materials they found most valuable, the teachers mentioned most frequently the paperback books and the Barnell-Loft skills booklets (see Table 22). After that, however, there was little plurality of opinion. In one school, for instance, a teacher was relying solely on the SRA kits, while in another the teacher had resigned all SRA kits to the storeroom, never to be used again. In one school the teacher used only paperback books, while in another the teacher used none (and both teachers received ratings of "5" – see below). One of the most promising techniques used in at least two schools was the use of good readers to teach poorer readers. Clearly, what works for one teacher may not work for another; what works for one class may not work for another. A number of teachers suggested a greater lattitude in the selection of materials appropriate to the particular teaching situation. For example in a boys' vocational high school, trade books related to the interest of the students would undoubtedly be of considerable benefit. In such cases, general paperback library materials more related to the interests of girls should be excluded. In light of these findings and the discovery that in most programs there were from 10 to 80 percent of the materials that teachers never intended to use, it is evident that a new method of selecting and distributing supplies is needed.

TABLE 22

Instructional Materials
That Teachers Found Most Effective in the Program
N = 60*

Instructional Material	Frequency of Times Mentioned	Percent of Times Mentioned
Paperback Books	42	23.33
Boning Specific Skills Series (Barnell-Loft)	31	17.22
Reading Attainment System (Grolier)	18	10.00
Dimensions Series (esp. We Are Black) (SRA)	18	10.00
Reading Laboratories (esp. IIC) (SRA)	12	6.67
Scope/Skills Books (Scholastic Books)	12	6.67
Modern Short Biographies (Globe)	7	3.89
Be a Better Reader (Prentice-Hall)	6	3.33
Real Stories (Globe)	6	3.33
Tactics in Reading (Scott Foresman)	6	3.33
Plays for Reading & for Today (Walker Educ. Bk.)	5	2.77
Reading for Understanding (SRA)	4	2.22
McCall-Crabbs (Teachers College)	3	1.67
Merrill Linguistic Readers (Charles E. Merrill)	3	1.67
Basic Reading Skills (Scott Foresman)	2	1.11
Reader's Digest Skill Builders (Reader's Digest)	2	1.11
Pilot Library Series (SRA)	1	0.56
Reading Development Kit (Addison Wesley)	1	0.56
Springboards (Noble & Noble)	1	0.56

*Number of teachers interviewed

The experts' ratings of classroom presentations (Table 23) assess, in part, the program's effectiveness in enabling teachers to diagnose and remediate reading disabilities. Almost 65 percent of the teachers were rated as "good" or "excellent" ("4" or "5"). Instruction, however, received the lowest ratings, with only 40 percent of the instances being rated as good or excellent. Perhaps this was because too many teachers relied on reading kits alone to do the teaching and failed to help students understand why their particular answers were right or wrong and how the reading-for reading's-sake exercises were related to the pupils' lives. In spite of this, the pupils received the highest ratings, indicating the excellent motivation on the part of the students, themselves, in carrying out self-directed reading activities. Nevertheless, these ratings indicate that the behavioral objectives were achieved: over 90 per-

cent of the teachers and over 80 percent of the instruction received ratings of 3.0 or better on the scale.[1]

TABLE 23

Experts' Ratings of Classroom Presentation on a 5-Point Scale

N* = 65

Attribute	1 f	1 %	2 f	2 %	3 f	3 %	4 f	4 %	5 f	5 %
TEACHER	0	0.0	5	7.7	18	27.7	27	41.5	15	23.1
$\bar{X}$ = 3.80										
S.D. = 0.89										
INSTRUCTION	0	0.0	12	18.4	27	41.6	14	21.6	12	18.4
$\bar{X}$ = 3.40										
S.D. = 1.00										
MATERIALS	1	1.5	8	12.3	18	27.7	11	16.9	27	41.6
$\bar{X}$ = 3.85										
S.D. = 1.15										
PHYSICAL FACILITIES	4	6.2	5	7.7	19	29.2	19	29.2	18	27.7
$\bar{X}$ = 3.65										
S.D. = 1.15										
PUPILS	1	1.5	1	1.5	16	24.6	17	26.2	30	46.2
$\bar{X}$ = 4.14										
S.D. = 0.95										

*Number of different teachers' classes observed.

Facilities by and large fell within the program guidelines. In most schools, a separate room for reading was established, with both adequate space for groups and individual work, and with storage facilities for the necessary materials. There were some notable exceptions, however, where classes were held in different rooms or where the reading room itself was a multi-purpose room, inadequate in size or generally inappropriate as a reading setting.

[1] Although the original evaluation proposal stated the criterion for this objective to be "at least 3.5 on a 7-point scale," the evaluators changed the criterion to "3.0 on a 5-point scale" – a slightly more rigerous standard.

A majority of the teachers indicated that they had attended the two all-day conferences and had found them most helpful. Dr. Eric Brown attended the second full-day workshop and gained a favorable impression from it and from those teachers who attended the workshop. The morning format of four problem-oriented seminars, set up at the suggestion of the teachers, was particularly effective. Personnel for this institute were from all indications excellent. Teachers also reported that the project coordinator and two reading specialist teacher-trainers had visited their classes frequently and had provided invaluable assistance in implementing the program. In spite of all of the help, however, most of the teachers requested more and better training in how to diagnose reading problems and how to best use the materials already received. Furthermore, teachers recommended that at least some conferences be held on a regional basis where teachers in a particular geographic area could get to know one another and share ideas and techniques.

In the interviews, only 15 percent of the teachers reported any formal coordination of the Reading Acceleration Program with the rest of the school, especially English. In 63 percent of the cases, teachers reported absolutely no coordination between the program and the school. The majority of the teachers saw the need for such coordination, but felt incapable of taking steps to solve the problem.

When asked the percentage of their pupils having English-as-a-second-language problems, teachers reported an overall average of 20 percent. Although 10 schools reported no ESL problems, three schools indicated that ESL students constituted from 75-80 percent of the program population. Many teachers just ignored the special needs of these ESL pupils, giving them the same dosage of kits and activities that were being given to other students. In speaking with these often highly motivated pupils, however, the evaluators discovered that far too many had little understanding of the pronunciations and meanings of the words they were being asked to read. The ESL population is – in the opinion of the evaulators – one of the major problems facing the program.

Although 75 percent of the program teachers were opposed to the use of the MAT as an instrument for evaluating reading progress, there seems to be little that they or the program can do about changing its use at this time.

In spite of the program's many problems, however, all of the teachers felt it was successful. Teachers liked especially the small class sizes and the highly motivated students, providing classes where there were little or no discipline problems, where pupils could relax in a non-competative atmosphere, where teachers could provide individual help, and where both teachers and pupils could work cooperatively together toward clearly defined and shared goals and feel a sense of accomplishment when these goals were achieved by the majority of the students.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The program should be refunded for another year and, if possible, started in the freshman and sophomore year if there are to be more important academic and vocational gains.

By all statistical measures of significance, and from the reports of various groups in the program, this special project was a success. The behavioral objectives were achieved and surpassed, and where the program was truly functioning, it was well received by administrators, teachers, and students. Students in this program were those who without it would likely have failed to achieve the minimal 8.0 reading grade now requisite for a high school diploma. They were in many instances angry, frustrated people. This program gave them something concrete to aim for that could make a great difference in their lives. Consequently, the students were the most strongly committed to its success.

The small class size was the best feature of the program to many teachers. It allowed teachers to get to know their students and to help them individually. They stated that they were teaching better and students were responding better, breaking out of the cycle of failure. Almost all of the teachers felt that the program coordinator and two teacher trainers had been of great assistance to them. Much of the success of the program is directly attributable to the imagination and persistence of the program coordinator and the two teacher-trainer reading specialists. Their responsiveness to individual teacher needs, their incorporation of the suggestions made in last year's evaluation, and their determination to implement the guidelines in each participating school were known and appreciated.

Fortunately this year the program was funded sufficiently early so that materials were available and pupils were efficiently scheduled for the reading classes. The most regretable feature of this project is that there are not more funds available that would allow reading problems to be earlier detected and appropriate action taken in all the New York City schools on a regular basis. Every effort should be made to provide additional funds for this program so that freshmen and sophomores also can be helped before the pressures of failure force these young people to drop out of school and drop on to the unemployment, welfare, and prison roles.

2. The criteria for evaluating the success of this program should be made more stringent.

Having all students achieve the 8.0 reading level as a condition for high school graduation is a laudable goal. The criterion for success in achieving this goal, however, would appear to be hardly minimal. That is, stating as an objective that *only* 30 percent of the students in this intensive reading program need make one year's reading progress in the course of a full year's instruction and that only 40 percent need read one book in a five-month period builds in a guaranteed success. At this point we would suggest that a higher expectation of success

would be in order. For instance, based on last year's and this year's statistics, it would seem more appropriate to set the following criteria: 40 percent of the students scoring below 7.1 on the MAT at the beginning of the program will attain at least a year's growth in reading score; 60 percent of the students beginning the program with an MAT score of 7.1 or better will attain an 8.0 reading level; and 50 percent of the pupils will read at least three books during a semester.

3. A larger percentage of the teachers chosen for the program should be qualified to teach reading, and the inservice training of teachers should be expanded to insure more effective instruction in the knowledge and techniques of diagnosing and remediating reading disabilities.

Informal comments of teachers and the experts' observations of classes showed that many of the teachers in the program did not have extensive experience in teaching remedial reading. In fact teachers readily admitted that they wished they had known better how to effectively and efficiently diagnose reading problems and use the materials they had been sent. Although they reported that the all-day conferences had been helpful, over and over teachers expressed the wish that they could have *seen* the techniques and approaches that Expert X had *talked* about. In addition, they wished they had had the opportunity to meet and talk with colleagues from neighboring schools in the program. It is suggested, therefore, that teachers be provided with more effective ways of diagnosing reading problems, that they be given more specific instruction in the use of the various program materials, that teacher training sessions make more extensive use of demonstrations, that videotapes of model classes and techniques be made available to participating teachers and schools, that specific instruction be provided in how to teach students having decoding and ESL problems (see below), and that at least some regional meetings be held to enable teachers to discuss problems and share solutions.

4. The procurement and allocation of materials should be greatly revised in order to meet more effectively the unique reading needs and interests of individual program teachers and pupils.

All reports from pupils and teachers indicated that a substantial share of the materials budget should be devoted to increasing the allotment of high-interest paperback books. In addition, teachers expressed a desire for materials for teaching decoding skills and more reading appropriate for the 4-6 grade reading levels; and both teachers and students indicated they wanted low-vocabulary books in the various subject areas, especially home economics, vocational trades, science, math, and social studies. Finally, each school should be allowed to select those materials they most want; otherwise too much is closeted and unused.

5. The students' activities in the program and their activities throughout the test of the school day should be related.

The present lack of coordination between the Reading Acceleration Program and the rest of the school is tragic, most often resulting in the student's being frustrated in every class except reading; for why should a pupil with a fifth grade reading level be forced to read eleventh grade material in English and social studies and math and science and vocational arts? Allowing pupils to function effectively for only one period of the day is not educationally sound. The total Reading Acceleration Program staff should seek means to insure that program pupils' reading needs are being met throughout the entire school day. Some possible ways of facilitating this might be: to have all program teachers write memos to the respective teachers of all program pupils, telling them about the program, indicating the pupils' reading levels, and offering assistance in the selection of appropriate reading materials for program pupils in the subject classrooms; to provide program pupils with appropriate-level reading materials for each of the other subjects they are taking; to offer program teachers a 4-1 teacher/inservice trainer assignment, in which the program teacher would devote the fifth period to training subject area teachers in how to provide for the reading needs of their pupils.

6. The program should provide more adequate instruction for pupils whose major problem is English as a second language.

In last year's final evaluation it was recommended that "There should be some attempt to screen out foreign language problems from the general population of those with inadequate reading skills." In spite of this recommendation, it was discovered that at least 20 percent of the pupils in this year's program had ESL problems. It was also discovered that the program had been unable to screen out foreign language problems because of the non-existence of ESL classes in which to place pupils. The gravity of this situation with regard, especially, to Spanish-speaking students was reported in the *New York Times* education section on July 30, 1972:

> Of the 250,000 Spanish-speaking students, more than 100,000 speak little or no English; some 86 percent are below normal in reading levels for their grade and age; more than 57 percent drop out of school and do not finish, as compared to a 46 percent drop-out rate of blacks and 29 percent for white students . . . .
>
> But so far, only 800 of the city's 57,000 teachers are bilingual, and their efforts reach only 4,200 of the 100,000 or more Puerto Rican students who need them most.

Clearly eleventh and twelfth grade pupils with ESL problems must be helped. If no ESL classes are available, the Reading Acceleration Program should do what it can to enable these young people to function effectively with the English language. What program teachers can do

– even without training in teaching ESL – is to recognize the problem, help pupils learn to speak and orally understand English before forcing them to read it, and develop backgrounds of experience with English words. Hopefully, however, extensive efforts will be made elsewhere to help solve this enormous ESL problem in the New York City schools.

APPENDIX A

List of High Schools Visited

List of High Schools Visited

Manhattan – Academic

1. Benjamin Franklin
2. Charles Evans Hughes
3. George Washington
4. Haaren
5. Louis Brandeis
6. Seward Park
7. Washington Irving

Bronx – Academic

8. De Witt Clinton
9. Evander Childs
10. James Monroe
11. Morris
12. Walton
13. Taft
14. Adlai Stevenson
15. Theodore Roosevelt

Brooklyn – Academic

16. Boys
17. Bushwick
18. Franklin K. Lane
19. George Wingate
20. Prospect Heights
21. Eastern District
22. Thomas Jefferson
23. Sheepshead Bay
24. South Shore
25. Abraham Lincoln
26. New Utrecht
27. Lafayette
28. Fort Hamilton
29. F. D. Roosevelt

Queens – Academic

30. Andrew Jackson
31. Springfield Gardens
32. Flushing
33. John Bowne
34. Martin Van Buren
35. Grover Cleveland
36. Francis Lewis
37. August Martin

Staten Island – Academic

38. Curtis
39. Susan E. Wagner

Manhattan – Vocational

40. Central Commercial
41. Fashion Industries
42. Food & Maritime
43. Mabel Dean Bacon
44. Manhattan
45. New York School of Printing

Bronx – Vocational

46. Alfred E. Smith
47. Jane Addams
48. Samuel Gompers

Brooklyn – Vocational

49. Automotive
50. Clara Barton
51. East New York
52. George Westinghouse
53. Sarah J. Hale
54. William H. Maxwell
55. William E. Grady
56. Alexander Hamilton

APPENDIX B

Instruments

New York University
Center for Field Research

CHECKLIST FOR ADMINISTRATION OF OSGOOD SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Introduce yourself: your name, from NYU, supposed to be evaluating this reading program, so you want to know how they feel since they're in it.
2. Put name on the three sheets. (Hand them the three S.D. sheets while you're talking.) Print clearly. Only reason for names is to match up the various sheets. Answers are going into a computer that won't know who they are.
3. Look at the three sheets. What we're trying to find out is how you feel about three things: (1) *School*, in general; (2) *This Class*; and (3) *Reading*.
4. No one will see your answers: not the teacher, not the principal. No one.
5. Notice that each page has a concept at the top with a set of eight scales underneath it. Each scale has seven dashes with a word at each end. What we want you to do is to rate the word at the top of the page along each of the eight scales underneath it.
6. For example: *DRUGS* good ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ bad
7. Rate "Drugs" according to how you feel right now. We want your immediate impressions. sions.
8. If you feel drugs are very *good* or very closely related to one end of the scale, put your mark like this:

   good X ____ ____ or ____ ____ X bad

   If you feel drugs are *quite close* to one end of the scale, put your mark like this:

   good ____ X ____ or ____ X ____ bad

   If you feel that drugs are *only slightly related* to one end of the scale, put your mark like this:

   good ____ ____ X or X ____ ____ bad

   If you feel that drugs are neutral, put your mark in the middle, like this:

   good____ ____ ____ X ____ ____ ____ bad
9. Sometimes the words at the end of each scale won't look like they have anything to do with the word at the top of the page. Even if this happens and the words are difficult to rate on certain scales, try to rate them anyway.
10. Try to work fairly quickly but also try to record your feelings accurately.
11. Be sure to check every scale for every thing.
12. Never put more than one checkmark on a single scale.
13. Try to place your checkmarks in the middle of each dash, as in the examples on the board. (The colons separate each dash on their copies.)

14. Now do this, for the words listed at the top of each page.
15. (Go around and check them, to make sure that no one student is making a mistake in the way he's filling out the scales.)
16. Collect the semantic differential ratings and hand out the four-page questionnaire.
17. Now look at this questionnaire. All you have to do is check off the answers that apply to you.
18. Make sure you fill in the heading completely.
19. Remember: your answers to these questions will not be seen by your teacher or anyone in this school. So answer the questions as honestly as you can.
20. Tell them that you will read the questions to them one by one. Explain more fully any items that need clarification.
21. Just before you collect them, check to make sure that everyone has filled in the items correctly.
22. Anyone who finishes before the rest of the group can go on and do any other reading assignment he has.
23. Thanks.

Your Name: _____

Today's Date: _____

Your School: _____

SCHOOL

HONEST	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	DISHONEST
BAD	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	GOOD
NICE	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	AWFUL
UNFAIR	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	FAIR
VALUABLE	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	WORTHLESS
HAPPY	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	SAD
FEROCIOUS	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	PEACEFUL
SOUR	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	SWEET

Your Name: _____

Today's Date: _____

Your School: _____

THIS CLASS

HONEST	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	DISHONEST
BAD	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	GOOD
NICE	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	AWFUL
UNFAIR	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	FAIR
VALUABLE	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	WORTHLESS
HAPPY	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	SAD
FEROCIOUS	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	PEACEFUL
SOUR	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	SWEET

Your Name: _____

Today's Date: _____

Your School: _____

READING

HONEST	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	DISHONEST
BAD	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	GOOD
NICE	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	AWFUL
UNFAIR	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	FAIR
VALUABLE	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	WORTHLESS
HAPPY	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	SAD
FEROCIOUS	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	PEACEFUL
SOUR	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	SWEET

New York University
Center for Field Research

READING ACCELERATION PROGRAM
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____ Date: _____
Grade: _____ Age: _____ School: _____

1. During what month did you enter this reading program?
   1. ____ September
   2. ____ October
   3. ____ November
   4. ____ December
   5. ____ January
   6. ____ February
   7 ____ March
   8. ____ April
   9. ____ May
2. What language is spoken at home?
   1. ____ Mostly English
   2. ____ Mostly Spanish
   3. ____ Mostly Chinese
   4. ____ Mostly French
   5. ____ English and Spanish equally
   6. ____ English and Chinese equally
   7. ____ English and French equally
   8. ____ Other
3. How often do you read *books*?
   1. ____ Never
   2. ____ Rarely
   3. ____ Sometimes
   4. ____ Often
4. How often do you read *magazines*?
   1. ____ Never
   2. ____ Rarely
   3. ____ Sometimes
   4. ____ Often

5. How often do you read *newspapers*?
   1. ____ Never
   2. ____ Rarely
   3. ____ Sometimes
   4. ____ Often
6. How often do you read *comic books*?
   1. ____ Never
   2. ____ Rarely
   3. ____ Sometimes
   4. ____ Often
7. About how many books written in English (not counting textbooks) have you read during the past month?
   1. ____ 0 - 2
   2. ____ 3 - 4
   3. ____ 5 - 6
   4. ____ 7 - 9
   5. ____ 10 or more
8. Since entering this reading class, how much reading have you been doing?
   1. ____ A lot less than I used to.
   2. ____ A little less than I used to.
   3. ____ The same amount as I used to.
   4. ____ A little more than I used to.
   5. ____ A lot more than I used to.
9. Are you learning things in this reading class that help you outside of school?
   1. ____ No
   2. ____ Yes
10. Since entering this reading class, how much have you used the library?
    1. ____ A lot less than I used to.
    2. ____ A little less than I used to.
    3. ____ As often as I used to.
    4. ____ A little more than I used to.
    5. ____ A lot more than I used to.
11. How does this reading class compare with your other classes?
    1. ____ This class is much worse.
    2. ____ This class is a little worse.
    3. ____ This class is about the same.
    4. ____ This class is a little better.
    5. ____ This class is much better.

12. Do *you* think your reading has improved this year?
    1. ____ It is a lot worse.
    2. ____ It is a little worse.
    3. ____ It is about the same.
    4. ____ It is a little better.
    5. ____ It is a lot better.
13. Since you've been attending this reading class, how do you feel about school?
    1. ____ It is a lot worse than it used to be.
    2. ____ It is a little worse than it used to be.
    3. ____ It is about the same as it used to be.
    4. ____ It is a little better than it used to be.
    5. ____ It is a lot better than it used to be.
14. Do you think that this class is helping your chances of getting a high school diploma?
    1. ____ No
    2. ____ Yes
15. This is your space to tell us anything you think we should know:

New York University
Center for Field Research

EVALUATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A. SCHOOL date: _____

1. School name: _____
2. % Boys: _____ % Girls: _____
3. Principal: _____
4. English Department Chairman: _____
5. Reading Teacher (s): _____

B. PUPILS

1. Number in program: _____
2. How long do pupils stay in program? _____
3. How are pupils chosen for program? _____
4. Grade levels of pupils? _____
5. % with ESL problems: _____
6. Are pupils forced to take this program? _____
7. What credit do pupils receive for taking program? _____

C. TEACHER

1. Type of license: _____ 2. Subject area: _____
3. Courses taken in reading: _____
4. MA Degree? _____ Major: _____
5. Number of years teaching experience: _____
6. Number of years teaching in this program: _____

D. PROGRAM

1. For how many years has the Read. Accel. Pgm. been in this school? _____
2. What are the objectives of the program, as you see them? _____
3. How are pupils' reading needs/weaknesses analyzed/diagnosed? _____

4. What specific approaches/materials are used to teach each of the specific reading areas identified? _____

5. Please describe the instructional procedures used in the program:

6. What percentage of the total program population are usually in attendance? _____

E. MATERIALS

1. What requests for materials have you made to the Central Board? _____

2. What materials have you received thus far this year? _____

3. What instructional materials (by name) have been most effective in the program?

F. FACILITIES

1. Do you have your own room for the program? _____
2. Is it adequate? _____

G. TRAINING

1. How has this program provided you with training in how to teach remedial reading?

_____

_____

_____

2. What specific ideas/approaches/techniques have you learned as a result of this training? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

H. ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION OF PROGRAM

1. How is time provided to allow pupils to participate in pgm? _____

_____

2. How is program coordinated with rest of school, esp. English? _____

_____

3. In what ways have parents & community been involved in program? _____

_____

I. TEACHER OPINION/EVALUATION

1. What is your professional opinion of the Board of Education's present use of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests? _____

_____

_____

_____

2. In your professional judgment, what do you believe to be the major causes for these pupils having reading problems? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. What do you think is good about the Reading Acceleration Pgm? _____

_____

_____

_____

4. If you were to improve the program, how would you improve it? _____

_____

_____

_____

5. Other comments:

New York University

Center for Field Research

HIGH SCHOOL READING ACCELERATION PROGRAM

Guidelines for Evaluating the Classroom Presentation

School _____ Teacher _____

Observer _____ Date _____ No. Boys ____ No. Girls _____

Give each category a rating of from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent):

TEACHER: _____

Consider teacher's enthusiasm, rapport with pupils, encouragement of pupils, self-confidence, knowledge of subject

INSTRUCTION: _____

Consider appropriateness of instruction to needs of individual pupils, clarity of presentation, extent of motivation and reinforcement

MATERIALS: _____

Consider appropriateness of materials used to the differing reading needs and interests of pupils

PHYSICAL FACILITIES: _____

Consider use of reading room by other teachers, size of room, attractiveness of room, flexibility of furniture, storage facilities, arrangement and display of materials

PUPILS: _____

Consider pupils' interest in program, degree of cooperation with teacher and each other, knowledge of what they are doing and why they are doing it, degree of self-confidence and self-direction

APPENDIX C

TABLES

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "SCHOOL" FOR FALL SEMESTER FOR FULL YEAR GROUP

(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	37	14	10	28	4	2	5
bad-good	5	1	1	21	11	17	44
nice-awful*	39	19	14	17	5	2	4
unfair-fair	12	3	5	20	9	13	39
valuable-worthless*	63	11	7	12	2	1	4
happy-sad*	32	16	13	25	4	4	6
ferocious-peaceful	6	3	6	29	12	14	30
sour-sweet	13	4	5	37	11	11	19

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "THIS CLASS" FOR FALL SEMESTER

(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	60	18	6	12	1	0	3
bad-good	2	1	2	9	5	14	67
nice-awful*	61	17	8	9	1	2	2
unfair-fair	3	1	3	9	8	14	62
valuable-worthless*	69	12	6	8	0	1	4
happy-sad*	50	18	10	17	2	1	2
ferocious-peaceful	2	1	3	12	6	14	62
sour-sweet	4	3	2	26	12	18	35

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "READING" FOR FALL SEMESTER FOR FULL YEAR GROUP
(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	62	11	7	16	1	1	2
bad-good	1	1	2	9	6	14	67
nice-awful*	63	14	7	10	2	1	3
unfair-fair	3	1	2	13	4	13	64
valuable-worthless*	73	8	5	9	1	1	3
happy-sad*	42	20	8	22	4	1	3
ferocious-peaceful	2	1	2	20	6	14	55
sour-sweet	4	1	2	30	11	18	34

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "SCHOOL" FOR SPRING SEMESTER FOR FULL YEAR GROUP
(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	23	20	17	27	4	4	5
bad-good	4	3	3	17	19	23	31
nice-awful*	25	19	22	23	6	1	4
unfair-fair	9	5	9	18	17	15	27
valuable-worthless*	47	16	12	16	4	1	4
happy-sad*	21	20	18	27	5	3	6
ferocious-peaceful	6	3	10	24	17	19	21
sour-sweet	8	4	10	39	16	12	11

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES
FOR CONCEPT "THIS CLASS" FOR SPRING SEMESTER
FOR FULL YEAR GROUP
(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	53	17	12	12	2	2	2
bad-good	1	1	3	6	11	19	59
nice-awful*	52	20	12	11	2	1	2
unfair-fair	3	1	4	9	13	16	54
valuable-worthless*	61	13	10	11	2	1	2
happy-sad*	38	24	14	15	3	2	4
ferocious-peaceful	4	1	4	14	7	21	49
sour-sweet	3	3	4	24	19	19	28

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES
FOR CONCEPT "READING" FOR SPRING SEMESTER
FOR FULL YEAR GROUP
(N = 339)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	53	18	12	13	2	1	1
bad-good	2	2	3	9	12	16	58
nice-awful*	42	26	14	12	3	2	1
unfair-fair	2	3	4	10	13	17	51
valuable-worthless*	66	11	10	9	0	1	3
happy-sad*	36	22	15	21	3	1	2
ferocious-peaceful	1	1	4	16	14	17	47
sour-sweet	3	2	4	29	15	21	26

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "SCHOOL" FOR FALL SEMESTER ONLY GROUP (N = 1215)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	32	16	12	29	5	2	4
bad-good	3	2	3	21	10	20	41
nice-awful*	35	18	14	22	4	3	4
unfair-fair	7	4	7	23	11	15	33
valuable-worthless*	61	11	8	12	3	1	4
happy-sad*	29	18	10	29	6	3	5
ferocious-peaceful	6	4	8	29	13	16	24
sour-sweet	7	4	6	44	11	12	16

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "THIS CLASS" FOR FALL SEMESTER ONLY GROUP (N = 1215)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	59	15	7	15	2	1	1
bad-good	2	1	1	10	9	14	63
nice-awful*	58	17	9	12	2	1	1
unfair-fair	3	2	2	9	7	14	63
valuable-worthless*	68	10	7	10	2	1	2
happy-sad*	47	18	10	19	3	1	2
ferocious-peaceful	2	1	2	16	7	14	58
sour-sweet	3	2	3	28	12	14	38

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "READING" FOR FALL SEMESTER ONLY GROUP (N = 1215)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	57	16	8	14	2	1	2
bad-good	2	1	1	9	6	15	66
nice-awful*	53	17	11	13	2	1	3
unfair-fair	3	1	2	12	7	16	59
valuable-worthless*	73	10	6	7	1	1	2
happy-sad*	40	18	10	26	2	2	2
ferocious-peaceful	2	1	2	19	8	13	55
sour-sweet	3	2	2	32	11	15	35

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "SCHOOL" FOR SPRING SEMESTER ONLY GROUP (N = 792)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	26	17	17	26	7	2	5
bad-good	4	3	6	19	18	19	31
nice-awful*	22	21	21	21	7	3	5
unfair-fair	11	4	10	20	15	15	25
valuable-worthless*	47	15	14	14	4	2	4
happy-sad*	21	18	18	30	4	3	6
ferocious-peaceful	9	5	7	25	20	15	19
sour-sweet	10	4	8	39	16	10	13

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "THIS CLASS" FOR SPRING SEMESTER ONLY GROUP

(N = 792)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	51	18	15	11	2	1	2
bad-good	2	1	3	9	11	20	54
nice-awful*	48	20	14	11	3	1	3
unfair-fair	3	3	4	12	11	15	52
valuable-worthless*	57	12	10	12	3	2	4
happy-sad*	35	19	17	20	3	2	4
ferocious-peaceful	3	2	2	12	11	17	53
sour-sweet	5	3	4	24	15	18	31

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE CHOICE ON ATTITUDE SCALES FOR CONCEPT "READING" FOR SPRING SEMESTER ONLY GROUP

(N=792)

Item	Rating 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest-dishonest*	49	18	13	14	2	2	2
bad-good	3	2	2	7	11	18	57
nice-awful*	45	19	15	13	3	2	3
unfair-fair	3	3	1	11	14	19	49
valuable-worthless*	65	10	9	9	2	2	3
happy-sad*	34	19	14	23	4	2	4
ferocious-peaceful	3	1	3	18	13	16	45
sour-sweet	3	2	4	32	13	18	28

*Note that for starred items, the positive pole is on the left; for unstarred items, the positive pole is on the right.